



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/334,671	06/17/1999	HENRI M. ROUGEOT	462-USA	5592
7590 10/29/2003				
GEORGE J PRIMAK 13480 HUNTINGTON PIERREONDS, QC H8Z 1G2 CANADA				
EXAMINER LEI, SIUN K				
ART UNIT 2878			PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/334,671	ROUGEOT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Shun Lee	2878

--Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** (check either a) or b))

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action, or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-12 and 14-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

*Constantine Hanna*  
 CONSTANTINE HANNAH  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP ART UNIT 2878

Continuation of 5 does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant states (first paragraph on pg. 2 of remarks filed 15 October 2003) that Morton discloses a fairly standard indirect x-ray image detector for radiology. First it should be noted that Applicant discloses (Figs. 2 and 3) a photoreceptor 16 with a common electrode 14 connected to a source of HT voltage (i.e., biased) and pixelated conduction pads 24. It should also be noted that Morton discloses (Figs. 6 and 7) a photoreceptor 201 with a common electrode 202 connected to a source of HT voltage (column 7, lines 24-29) and pixelated collection electrodes 101 (column 7, lines 1-6).

Applicant then appears to argue that photoreceptor 201 are of necessity pixelated (illustrated in applicant's lower Figure on pg. 2 as "pixelated structure") since the separation of charges comes from pixelation whereas photoreceptor 16 is not pixelated (illustrated in applicant's lower Figure on pg. 3 as "No pixelation") since it is the electric field that provides the position of the charges. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Morton states (column 7, lines 54-65) that "There is also provided on surface S1 a thin, narrow layer 203 of heavily-doped n<sup>+</sup>-type material (a-Si:H:n<sup>+</sup>) which substantially surrounds each charge-collection 101 and its associated field effect transistor 31. Also, a layer 204 of heavily-doped p<sup>+</sup>-type material (a-Si:H:p<sup>+</sup>) is deposited on each electrode 101. The spatial distribution of layers 203,204 is such as to create potential minima Pm within the second capacitor 20, as shown in idealised form in FIG. 7, so that charge (in this embodiment electrons) produced within layer 201 is constrained to move within a potential well and is thereby focussed onto the respective charge-collection electrode". Thus common electrode 202 (connected to a source of HT voltage) and pixelated collection electrodes 101 (with associated structures 203,204) create an electric field having a potential minima Pm that constrain and drive charge movement and it is also clear from the description and Figs. 6 and 7 that photoreceptor 201 is not pixelated. Thus applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Continuation of 10 Other: see attached interview summary. In response to applicant's comments in regard to the interview, applicant should note that no agreement was reached during the interview. Instead, it was suggested that the arguments be submitted for further consideration.